

Neighborhood Planning for Community Revitalization

Cleveland Neighborhood Revitalization Program Evaluation

A CONSORTIUM PROJECT OF: Augsburg College; College of St. Catherine; Hamline University; Higher Education Consortium for Urban Affairs; Macalester College; Metropolitan State University; Minneapolis Community College; Minneapolis Neighborhood Revitalization Program; University of Minnesota (Center for Urban and Regional Affairs; Children, Youth and Family Consortium; Minnesota Extension Service); University of St. Thomas; and Minneapolis community and neighborhood representatives.

CURA RESOURCE COLLECTION

**Center for Urban and Regional Affairs
University of Minnesota
330 Humphrey Center**

**Cleveland Neighborhood
Revitalization Program Evaluation**

Conducted on behalf of
Cleveland Neighborhood Association

Prepared by
Amy Brock, Cleveland Neighborhood Association
Taimur Malik, Graduate Research Assistant
University of Minnesota
September 2001

*This report (NPCR 1167) is also available at the following internet address:
<http://www.npcr.org>*

September 2001

Neighborhood Planning for Community Revitalization (NPCR) supported the work of the authors of this report, but has not reviewed it for publication. The content is solely the responsibility of the authors and is not necessarily endorsed by NPCR.

NPCR is coordinated by the Center for Urban and Regional Affairs at the University of Minnesota. NPCR is supported by grants from the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development's East Side Community Outreach Partnership Center, the McKnight Foundation, Twin Cities Local Initiatives Support Corporation (LISC), the St. Paul Foundation, and The St. Paul.

Neighborhood Planning for Community Revitalization
330 Hubert H. Humphrey Center
301 - 19th Avenue South
Minneapolis, MN 55455

phone: 612-625-1020

e-mail: npcr@freenet.msp.mn.us

website: <http://www.npcr.org>

Table of Contents

Introduction.....	3
Geographical location of the Cleveland Neighborhood.....	4
Census data	4
An overview of the NRP plan	5
Marketing	6
Stability	6
Investment	6
Survey Details.....	7
Cleveland Neighborhood Survey -- (Proportions).....	8
Neighborhood concerns expressed by survey respondents	12
Specific Improvements required in the neighborhood	14
Reasons stated by respondents for moving out of Cleveland Neighborhood	18
Cleveland Neighborhood Survey	19
Focus Group.....	25
Individual Projects.....	29
Project: Home Improvement Loan Program	29
Project: Exterior Home Improvement Program	33
Project: Rental Rehabilitation Grant Program.....	36
Project: Permanent Landscaping Program	38
Project: Pedestrian friendly lighting for Lowry Ave. N & Penn Ave. N.....	41
Project: Clean sweep	44
Project: Friends of Cleveland (Business Exterior Grant).....	46
Project: South East Asian Initiative	49
Project: Summer Festival.....	52

Introduction

The Cleveland Neighborhood was selected to participate in the Neighborhood Revitalization Program in May of 1993. The Neighborhood Revitalization Program approved funding for C.N.A. in August of 1993. NRP was planned in two phases. Resident volunteers wrote the NRP action plan. It took about 8 months to write. The action plan was finalized on December 11th, 1995 and subsequently the development work started. At this time, Phase I of NRP is near completion in the Cleveland Neighborhood. The NRP provided the Cleveland Neighborhood an opportunity to improve their neighborhood conditions by providing funds and technical expertise based on the needs and decisions by its people. The Neighborhood Revitalization Program provided Cleveland with \$ 1,059,096 for Phase I development plan. The residents of the Cleveland Neighborhood have volunteered numerous hours of hard work to make their neighborhood a better and a safer place to live. Currently, CNA has contracted 62% of \$1,059,096 (original allocation), and spent \$ 656,987 on its Phase I plan and the remaining funds are \$ 402,109 (June 12th, 2001). Overall 95% is contracted and 85% is implemented. The Cleveland residents and staff are now evaluating the work done during Phase I. After completion of the Phase I evaluation, CNA will enter Phase II of its development plan and will receive the second portion of NRP funds. During this evaluation phase, the residents will collectively determine how successful was Phase I. They will identify any weakness in the Phase I implementation. This information will help to identify new program needs for Phase II, identify programs that do not need to continue and complete the development plan for this neighborhood.

Geographical location of the Cleveland Neighborhood

The Cleveland neighborhood is located in North Minneapolis. There are about 1330 households and 3440 people living in this neighborhood. The boundaries of this neighborhood are: North-Dowling, South-Lowry, East-Penn and West-Xerxes Ave. N. The neighboring neighborhoods are: North-Victory, South-Jordan, and East-Folwell.

Census data

The total population in Cleveland Neighborhood is 3440 in the year 2000 as compared to 3216 in the year 1990. The change in population in this decade is 6.97%. According to the year 2000 data the Cleveland neighborhood reflects the following statistics in terms of race and ethnicity: Whites-52.27%, African Americans-30.41%, American Indians-1.40%, Asian/Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islanders-10.09%, Other races-1.42%, Population of two or more races-4.42% and Hispanic/Latino-3.17%

Race	1990	2000
White	2808	1798
African American	314	1046
American Indians	53	48
Asian / Pacific Islanders	30	347
Other	11	49

An overview of the NRP plan

At time the NRP action plan was written, the Cleveland Neighborhood was lacking in the areas of marketing, investment and stability. There were crime and safety issues in the neighborhood. The businesses were moving out of the area and there were no incentives for new businesses to move into in. The Cleveland neighborhood has increasingly become more diverse. The majority of Cleveland residents own their homes, however there was a need for provision of funds to the homeowners to improve the housing conditions. There was a litter problem in the neighborhood that needed a solution.

The NRP plan was written with a focus on three main groups.

1. Marketing
2. Stability
3. Investment

At that time when the NRP action plan was written, there was a need for projecting the image of Cleveland Neighborhood in a positive way that could attract investors and businesses into the neighborhood. Then there was a need for improving the conditions in the neighborhood that would maintain a certain neighborhood standard. The residents wanted to make the Cleveland neighborhood an attractive place for people to stay and move into the neighborhood. They wanted to attract new businesses into the neighborhood. The residents were concerned about the safety of the residents and wanted the neighborhood to be crime and drug free. The executive summary of the NRP action plan stated the following:

Marketing

The objectives of the marketing group were:

- To find the unique objective of the Cleveland neighborhood
- Identify market segments as promotional targets
- Identify available programs, activities, events and amenities which could be touted in promotional material
- Identify an existing or potential event which could draw people together from both within the neighborhood and greater Minneapolis
- Identify ways to reach the target markets
- Develop goals and strategies toward implementation

Stability

This group worked to:

- Identify the primary reasons people and businesses move to and stay in Cleveland neighborhood
- Identify the shortcomings in the neighborhood that lead people and business to move away
- Develop goals and strategies to enhance the reasons people stay in Cleveland and minimize the reasons people leave
- Determine which activities will have the greatest impact on the neighborhood

Investment

The objectives of this group were:

- Identify the existing strengths of Cleveland's physical environment
- Identify problem areas and real or psychological barriers to investment
- Determine what types and levels of investments will have the greatest impact on the neighborhood

- Develop goals, objectives and strategies to promote high quality public and private investment

Survey Details

Survey date: July 15th, 2001

Number of surveys mailed: **1206**

Number of surveys returned: **140**

Proportion returned: $140 \times 100 / 1206 = 11.61\%$

The neighborhood survey was a part of the Neighborhood Revitalization Program review process. The survey form contained 14 questions. Only three questions were open ended. The remaining 11 questions had a Yes/No or a selection format. The open-ended questions were designed to get neighborhood opinions.

1206 survey forms were mailed out to the neighborhood homes inserted in the monthly Cleveland Neighborhood newsletter. The newsletter contained an article on this survey and served as a covering letter along

with the survey form. A self-addressed envelope was provided to return the survey form. Cleveland Neighborhood Association was unable to provide return postage for these survey form, because of the shortage of funds. The C.N.A. office received 140 filled forms from the neighborhood.

The questions in the survey form were designed to get the following information:

- Resident's overall neighborhood satisfaction level
- Resident satisfaction with C.N.A. administered programs, based on the NRP Action-Plan
- If the Cleveland residents found these programs useful and whether they benefited from them
- Neighborhood concerns. These concerns will be taken into account when writing the Phase II Action-Plan
- Desired neighborhood improvements that may be included in Phase II of the NRP
- Recruitment of more volunteers to work for the C.N.A.

Cleveland Neighborhood Survey -- (Proportions)

1. Is English your native language? Yes 97 % No 3 %
 - If No, what is your native language?
3 respondents out of 140 said Hmong – 2 %
1 respondent out of 140 said Spanish – 0.7 %
2. Do you know what the Cleveland Neighborhood Association (C.N.A.) does?
Yes 82 % No 15 %, (If you have checked No then skip to question No: 7)
3. Do you attend C.N.A. neighborhood meetings or events?
Yes 38 % No 47 %

4. Has the Cleveland Neighborhood Association ever helped you?

Yes 42 % No 42 %

5. What C.N.A. community programs have you benefited from?

(Check all that apply)

i.	Housing Loan Program	9 %	v.	Block Clubs	35 %
ii.	Walk patrol	18 %	vi.	Summer Festival	16 %
iii.	Litter patrol	16 %	vii.	Flooding Committee	10 %
iv.	Landscape grant program	21 %	viii.	Crime & Safety Committee	18 %

6. Are you satisfied with the help that the Cleveland Neighborhood Association provided?

Yes 57 % No 5 %

7. If you have neighborhood concerns, what are they?

Please see appendix

8. What specific improvements do you want to see in your community?

Please see appendix

9. What do you like about living in the Neighborhood? (Check all that apply)

i.	Neighborhood appearance	51 %	vi.	Housing conditions	31 %
ii.	Neighborhood Park	36 %	vii.	Jobs for area residents	8 %
iii.	Safe place for living	27 %	viii.	Social services	4 %
iv.	Business development	2.1 %	ix.	Sense of community	47 %
v.	Appearance and quality of local business	6 %	x.	Property value	55 %

10. How would you rate your neighborhood as a place to live?

Excellent 3 % Very good 29 % Good 47 % Fair 19 % Poor 1 %

11. In general, how would you describe the living conditions in Cleveland Neighborhood?

Getting better 45 %

Staying about the same 32 %

Getting worse 18 %

12. Would you recommend this neighborhood to a friend or a family member as a good place to live?

Yes 71 % No 25 %

13. Do you plan to stay in this neighborhood for the next 5 years? Yes 71 % No 21 %

If no, please state reason for wanting to move:

14. Would you like to volunteer in your neighborhood? Yes 24

15. Please rate the quality of each of the following in your neighborhood: (Check that applies)

Topic	Very Good	Good	Fair	Poor	Don't know
Housing maintenance	5.5%	51%	34%	7%	1 %
Yard maintenance	5.5%	47%	39%	7%	0 %
Street & Alley maintenance	5.5%	26%	40%	27%	1 %
Park & recreational facilities	10%	45%	24%	8.2%	8%
Street lighting	6.2%	47%	32%	12%	1 %
Parking	13%	56%	20%	5%	2 %
Shopping facilities	2.1%	16%	20%	52%	8 %
City housing inspection	2.7%	23%	19%	12%	37 %
Community life	6.2%	47%	32%	3%	6 %
City garbage service	40%	49%	8%	2%	1 %
Safety	4.8%	29%	47%	16%	0.7 %
Drug traffic control	3.4%	16%	28%	25%	25 %
City recycling service	36%	49%	6%	4%	5 %
Neighborhood business appearance	2.1%	23%	44%	23%	7 %
Litter	2.1%	19%	36%	40%	0 %
Crime prevention	1.4%	29%	42%	12%	11 %
Racial discrimination	6.8%	23%	18%	9%	34 %
Senior citizen services	1.4%	8%	13%	7%	66 %
Standard of living	4.8%	50%	34%	3%	5 %
Property values	21%	50%	19%	2%	6 %
Rental values	2.1%	5%	8%	5%	72 %
Opportunity for new business	2.7%	10%	12%	11%	58.2 %
Quality of news letter	29%	55%	8%	1%	3.4 %
Energy conservation measures	4.1%	13%	12%	5%	59.6 %
Environmental preservation	4.1%	10%	14%	8%	56.2 %

Survey--Question No: 7

Neighborhood concerns expressed by survey respondents

- Poorly maintained properties
- Rental properties in poor condition
- Neighborhood appearance
- Residents not caring about overgrown grass and overgrown trees
- Residents who do not shovel snow in winters
- Poor yard maintenance
- Junk and old cars in back yards
- Poorly lit streets and alleys
- Litter on streets and alleys
- Please clean Washburn Ave. N
- Flooding and basement flooding

- Less police visibility and police patrolling in the neighborhood
- Nuisance created by use of illegal fireworks/crackers
- Increased incidence of shootings and sound of gunshots
- Drug-trafficking/Drug-houses/Gangs
- Diminishing sense of personal security
- Increased incidence in crime rate
- Safety of families, children and senior citizens
- Increased thefts and burglaries
- Make our streets safer

- Speeding cars on alleys and residential streets

- Cars racing through alleys between 35th and 36th on Queen Avenue side of Penn trying to avoid traffic lights on 36th
- Boom-cars/loud music played in cars while in the residential area

- Teenage loitering on residential streets and alleys
- Kids with nothing to do
- Kids out on the streets after curfew
- Kids using pellet guns in residential areas
- Unsupervised children vandalizing/destroying other peoples property
- Noise generated by kids running through alleys
- Bus stops where kids get on the bus are littered
- Nuisance created by barking dogs/wandering dogs and cats
- People consistently stopping to urinate in alley way 35th to 36th Queen side

- Unruly/rude neighbors
- Residents disrespectful towards other residents and their property
- Public urination
- Graffiti on garages

- News-letter received late by residents
- Help a homeless man at 3758 Sheridan Avenue

Survey--Question No: 8

Specific Improvements required in the neighborhood

- Accountability by rental property owners for their debilitated properties
- Replace blighted property with better looking homes
- Vacant house clean up program
- Yard inspection program
- More housing loan programs & home improvement grants
- Help low income people with provision of loans for property maintenance
- Expanded landscaping program
- Clean yards, streets and alleys
- Litter control
- Install more trash cans
- Install "No Littering" signs inside neighborhood
- Place garbage cans by school
- Improved and nicely mowed lawns
- Need improved and efficient snow shoveling off the side walks in winters
- Clean streets and sidewalks
- Clean Penn and 26th

- Clean alleys between 32nd of Thomas and Upton
- Clean up house stock
- Clean side walk and area outside gas station Conoco on Penn 34th
- Clean the 2 businesses on Lowry Avenue and also the houses North of these businesses
- Take action on vacant property located on SE corner of 34th and Russell
- New sewer system on 35th
- Fix properties to code
- City inspectors should enforce rules on badly kept properties and businesses
- Educate people about recycling and cleanliness
- Clean Lowry
- Expanded and more efficient flood control program
- Plant more trees
- Welcoming street scape is required in the neighborhood
- Dog litter bags and litter clean-up
- Make this neighborhood less noisy
- Bike lane on Dowling Avenue is required
- Improve bus service
- Include Robins dale

- Improved lighting at Penn and Lowry
- Install more motion lights on streets and alleys/dark spots
- Install pedestrian friendly lighting
- Improved street and alley lighting
- Post speed limit for cars/motorcycles
- Police should enforce speed limits in residential areas
- Make speed bumps on streets and alleys inside neighborhood

- Install more 4-way stop signs inside the neighborhood
- Police should give tickets to noisy cars/motorcycles and cars playing loud music inside the neighborhood
- Restrict parking to one side of streets

- Increase police patrol in the neighborhood
- More visibility of police squad cars in the neighborhood
- Increased police visibility
- Police sub-station on Penn Ave.
- Faster 911 police response wanted
- Expanded and more frequent resident patrol program is needed
- Crime watch program needed/Organized neighborhood watch program is needed
- Crime awareness and prevention
- Reduce the crime rate
- Close drug houses
- Drugs sold at bus stop and nearby buildings on 36th and Penn
- Stop the use of illegal fire-crackers in the neighborhood

- Frequent neighborhood get together are needed
- Increased neighborhood involvement needed
- Increase ethnic group (African American, Spanish, Asian residents) involvement in neighborhood activities
- Neighbors respectful to neighbors needed
- Welcome package stores/maps
- Signage

- More after school programs for kids

- Encourage park use by public
- Frequent police patrolling near park is needed/Police visibility in park area is needed
- Safe walking area needed

- More businesses required in the neighborhood like:
A medicine shop, Book-store, Post-office, Bank, Bakery, Restaurant, Video-store, Gas Station, Coffee shop and a Rainbow Store
- Cafe on 39th and Thomas
- Penn intersection & 44th-coffee shop is adorable, we need such places near our neighborhood
- Make Dowling business district trendier

- Increased feeling of community wanted
- Increased sense of neighborliness is wanted
- More help for seniors
- Increased sense of pride in self and community
- Monthly community meetings
- Access to city council meetings
- Teach people to maintain their homes
- Teach people pet care
- Create a garden club
- National night out

- More programs for youth activities
- More activities for youth
- Control troubled kids
- Parents should supervise their children
- More community/school - parent involvement needed

- Improved parks and play ground facilities

Survey--Question No: 13

**Reasons stated by respondents for moving out of Cleveland
Neighborhood**

27 out of 123 respondents answered this question. Proportion= 21.95%

- This neighborhood offers a low quality of life
- This neighborhood is not a nice place to raise children
- Too much disturbance by traffic inside the neighborhood
- People/teens/kids roaming on alleys and streets, children in intersections
- Excessive littering on the streets/alleys
- Increased crime in the neighborhood
- More rental properties than ever before
- Want a quieter neighborhood with a fewer safety concerns
- Need a bigger house

- Moving to a smaller house near kids
- Too noisy neighborhood
- Less caring neighbors
- Want a neighborhood with better shopping facilities
- Want to move to an area with less/no crime
- Friends and relatives think that I am living in a dangerous place, so they want me to move out of this neighborhood
- Retiring
- I want to move to a more stable neighborhood
- I will move out because of the flooding problem
- I want to live near my work place
- There is increased crime and lack of police support in this neighborhood
- We have been robbed three times
- Higher tax, higher car insurance premium because of high crime area
- Need a better school for children
- Tired of neighbors

Cleveland Neighborhood Survey

Fifteen minutes of your time on this survey will help your neighborhood organization focus its efforts to improve our neighborhood. Your opinion matters. Thank you! (Please check all that apply)

1. Is English your native language? Yes_____ No_____

- If No, what is your native language? _____

2. Do you know what the Cleveland Neighborhood Association (C.N.A.) does?

Yes_____ No_____, (If you have checked No then skip to question No: 7)

3. Do you attend C.N.A. neighborhood meetings or events?

Yes_____ No_____

4. Has the Cleveland Neighborhood Association ever helped you?

Yes_____ No_____

5. What C.N.A. community programs have you benefited from? (Check all that apply)

- | | | | | | |
|------|-------------------------|-------|-------|--------------------------|-------|
| ix. | Housing Loan Program | _____ | xiii. | Block Clubs | _____ |
| x. | Walk patrol | _____ | xiv. | Summer Festival | _____ |
| xi. | Litter patrol | _____ | xv. | Flooding Committee | _____ |
| xii. | Landscape grant program | _____ | xvi. | Crime & Safety Committee | _____ |

6. Are you satisfied with the help that the Cleveland Neighborhood Association provided?

Yes_____ No_____

7. If you have neighborhood concerns, what are they?

1-

2-

3-

8. What specific improvements do you want to see in your community?

1-

2-

3-

9. What do you like about living in the Neighborhood? (Check all that apply)

- | | | | | | |
|-------|--|-------|--------|-------------------------|-------|
| xi. | Neighborhood appearance | _____ | xvi. | Housing conditions | _____ |
| xii. | Neighborhood Park | _____ | xvii. | Jobs for area residents | _____ |
| xiii. | Safe place for living | _____ | xviii. | Social services | _____ |
| xiv. | Business development | _____ | xix. | Sense of community | _____ |
| xv. | Appearance and quality of local business | _____ | xx. | Property value | _____ |

10. How would you rate your neighborhood as a place to live?

Excellent____ Very good____ Good____ Fair____ Poor____

11. In general, how would you describe the living conditions in Cleveland Neighborhood?

Getting better____ Staying about the same____ Getting worse____

12. Would you recommend this neighborhood to a friend or a family member as a good place to live?

Yes____ No____

13. Do you plan to stay in this neighborhood for the next 5 years? Yes____ No____

If no, please state reason for wanting to move:

14. Please rate the quality of each of the following in your neighborhood: (Check that applies)

Topic	Very Good	Good	Fair	Poor	Don't know
-------	-----------	------	------	------	------------

Housing maintenance					
Yard maintenance					
Street & Alley maintenance					
Park & recreational facilities					
Street lighting					
Parking					
Shopping facilities					
City housing inspection					
Community life					
City garbage service					
Safety					
Drug traffic control					
City recycling service					
Neighborhood business appearance					
Litter					
Crime prevention					
Racial discrimination					
Senior citizen services					
Standard of living					
Property values					
Rental values					
Opportunity for new business					
Quality of news letter					
Energy conservation measures					
Environmental preservation					

Please place a stamp on the provided self-addressed envelope and mail this survey form before July 31st, 2001, because your opinion matters. Thank you for filling out this survey form.

Please fill the following if you want to participate in the North End hardware store gift certificate draw or register as a volunteer with the C.N.A.

Would you like to volunteer in your neighborhood? Yes____ No____

If yes, please provide the following information:

Name:

Address:

E-mail:

Tel No:

For further information please contact:

Amy Brock

The Cleveland Neighborhood Association Office

PO Box 11635, Minneapolis, MN 55411

Tel. No: (612) 522-8167

cna@mtn.org

Thank you for taking the time to complete this survey! As an incentive to return this form, we will be giving away gift certificates for the North End Hardware.

To be included in the draw, return this portion to our office in the provided envelope before July 31st. Draw will be held at our C.N.A. office on the evening of July 31st. You must provide your name & telephone number in order to qualify.

Name: _____

Phone: _____

(If you want to remain anonymous, then mail the portion below dotted line separately to C.N.A. before July 31st)

Focus Group

Date held: July 25th, 2001

Duration: 1 hour and 15 minutes

Participants:

- | | |
|---------------------|---------------------|
| ▪ Pete O' Brien | ▪ Pastor Ray Ormand |
| ▪ Jeanette Le Verne | ▪ Sue Nelson |
| ▪ Jenny Murphy | ▪ Lynn Moriarty |

Location: C.N.A. Office, Lucy Laney Craft School Bldg.

i. The participants held the view that the following programs were successful and helped bring a positive change in the Cleveland neighborhood:

- Lighting near the bridge
- Tree plantation
- Home improvement revolving loan fund program
- Demolition of old homes
- Moving of homes
- Corridor study
- Baby sitting program
- Installing stop signs
- Walk patrol
- Sub-station

The focus group participants thought that the following were a barrier in the success of a few programs:

- The reluctant attitude of landlords to invest funds in order to improve their rental property
 - The landlords were outreached three times for the rental rehab loan program. These funds were moved to home owners program due to their non-cooperating attitude
- ii. The participants held the view that the Cleveland Neighborhood Association is playing a great role in the development and uplift of the Neighborhood. On commenting upon the C.N.A.'s monthly newsletter the participants thought that the newsletter is light, informative, non-political and well written. The quality of the newsletter was thought to be high. The participants recognized the hard-effort and time spent by Amy Brock in writing this newsletter. Amy is the 4th staff person since the Cleveland has started its participation in the Neighborhood Revitalization Program.
- iii. The participants appreciated the variance of power granted to the neighborhood residents by the NRP. One of the advantages by granting variance of power is that the residents now don't have to visit the city offices and their neighborhood problems are taken care of in the neighborhood. It was suggested the new board members should be trained when they assume a position. They should become familiar with contracts, by-laws and action plan. It was suggested that the number of residents attending the meeting should increase.

- iv. The focus group participants thought that at the time of requesting and recruiting volunteers it should be made clear to the new volunteers what C.N.A. expects, in terms of the nature of duties and the number of hours required for volunteer work. There was an idea to involve the block club leaders to recruit more volunteers. It was suggested to give recognition to volunteers for their services, like certificates of merit, nametags and banquets. There was an idea to list the names of volunteers who worked more than 20 hours in the newsletter quarterly in a year as a way of appreciation.
- v. It was suggested that C.N.A. should design and implement more programs that involve working with senior residents and teen-agers.
- vi. A need for a C.N.A. web page was felt with clearinghouse information listed on this web page.
- vii. The focus group participants suggested some ideas for the NRP Phase II:
 - Surrounding neighborhood collaborations, with possible fund sharing incentives
 - Help for seniors in yard work and painting jobs
 - Expanded news letter with information about ECFE, social programs
 - Increased school and community activities
 - After school activities
 - Establishing a gymnasium, meeting room and computer room for the residents
- viii. Participants thought that the following programs should not be continued any further because of their ineffectiveness:

- Economic development
- Rental rehabilitation

They thought that the following programs should continue:

- Tree planting program
- Expanded landscaping improvements
- Hire an electrician to wire garages for installing motion lights
- Seek animal control services
- Rental service which can provide new home movers with lawn mowers, shovels and other hardware for yard and house maintenance work

Individual Projects

Cleveland Neighborhood Project Evaluation

Project: Home Improvement Loan Program

Project Coordinator:

- Cleveland Neighborhood Association (CNA) Housing Committee
- North side Neighborhood Housing Services (NSNHS)

Housing Committee:

- Jenny Murphy
- Sue Hinzman
- Francine Pimpton
- Mike Theisen
- Marilyn Whitfield
- Barb Fitz Patrick
- Arved Erickson
- Debra Jackson
- Harrie

Volunteer Hours:

- There is no precise record of volunteer hours that were invested on this project.
- The majority of the volunteer hours were spent on finding a loan administrator, working with the administrator and monitoring the project.

Money allocated to the project:

- \$ 226,000

Money spent out of the allocated budget:

- All the money has been spent.

Project Objective:

- Develop and implement programs that improved neighborhood appearance, housing quality and property value.
- Revolving Loan Program: This program was created to provide the Cleveland residents with low interest loans.
- These loans were used for exterior and interior home improvements.
- CNA worked with North side Housing Services to establish, implement and promote the Revolving Loan Program for Cleveland residents.
- This program was developed to encourage Cleveland residents to improve, update and expand their houses.
- This program provided Cleveland property owners to bring their properties to match the code.
- This program added quality, appearance, value and integrity to the neighborhood houses.
- The Revolving Loan Program assisted lower income residents to obtain low cost financing to improve their houses.
- This program provided funding to residents who wanted to improve their property, but for a variety of reasons could not participate in the EHFNA grant programs or other MCDA programs.
- This program encouraged a lasting sense of pride among neighborhood property owners.

- One of the objectives of this program was to retain existing residents while attracting new residents.
- This program was user friendly and had simple guidelines.
- This program encouraged property improvements that could not have occurred without this program.
- This program was design in a way that once set in motion, runs itself through the administering lending institution, with only minimal oversight from the neighborhood.
- CNA and NSHS made sure that loans get used and were available to all residents.
- This program was flexible in loan re-payment terms.
- Residents that were in most need of subsidized financing had the first opportunity to participate.

Project Details:

- CNA board set up a Housing Committee.
- The housing committee and the CNA staff worked with MCDA's Residential Financial Department and North Side Housing Services to develop and implement Revolving Loan Program.
- They established program guidelines such as type of loans, income limit for borrowers, maximum loan amount, loan interest rate, maximum term and work eligible for loan.
- Program was administered through NSHS.
- 56 Cleveland residents have received loans averaging \$11,309 each.
- Total amount of money received by Cleveland residents from NSEHS is \$63,317.
- New loans became available when existing loans were paid off.
- The borrower had to pay an interest rate of 3-5%.

- The maximum loan limit was \$25000.
- Minimum loan limit was \$1000.
- A household could take more than one loan, however only one loan per household was allowed per year.

Areas for improvement:

- This was a good program, but with administrative problems.
- This program was not marketed effectively.
- There was reporting and communication deficiency between NSHS and CNA.
- There were administrative issues between residents and NSHS.

Recommendations for future improvements or additional program needs:

- Consider changing administrator.
- More funding is required for this program.

Beneficiaries:

- 56 Cleveland Neighborhood residents.
- Cleveland Neighborhood and its residents in general.

Overall Project Rating:

☆ ☆ ☆ ☆

Cleveland Neighborhood Project Evaluation

Project: Exterior Home Improvement Program

Project Coordinator:

- North side Housing Services
- Cleveland Neighborhood Association Housing Committee

Budget:

- \$76,500

Money spent and remaining balance:

There are two fund pools in this program:

- Pool 1:

Total amount: \$51,500

6 loans closed totaling: 30,000

Remaining balance: 21500 (as of 6/1/01)

- Pool 2:

Total amount: \$25,000

2 loans closed totaling: 9,000

Remaining balance: \$16,000 (as of 6/1/01)

Project Objective:

- This program was designed to assist homeowners in addressing significant maintenance problems in existing homes and garages.
- Funds were made available to Cleveland homeowners for exterior home improvements.

Project Details:

- There were two funding pools:
\$50,000 and **\$25,000**
- **\$50,000** was used to fund improvements to properties with significant deferred maintenance problems. These properties were in the highest level of despair and had priority to receive this fund.
- **\$25,000** was awarded to homeowners on the basis of lottery held on the April 17th drawing. This lottery gave all the Cleveland residents a chance to receive exterior home improvement funds regardless of the property condition.
- A property owner could receive funds from only one pool.
- Cleveland Housing Committee evaluated all properties entered in the drawing for the levels of despair.
- The Committee used an objective rating system to evaluate the properties and its decision was final.
- The improvement had to be cited as a code violation by city of Minneapolis Housing Inspections Department.
- Properties had to be owner occupied.

- Depending on family income funds had to be matched with homeowner provided funds.
- The minimum loan available was \$1000 and the maximum amount was \$5000.
- The loan was forgiven after 3 years.
- If the property ownership changed within 3 years then 100% loan had to be paid back.
- The maximum income level for this program was 80% of the Minneapolis median family income, adjusted for family size.

Areas for improvement:

- The North side Housing Services was inefficient in outreaching people.
- There were limited funding available to be invested in this program.

Recommendations for future improvements or additional program needs:

- Change the administrator (NSHS)

Beneficiaries:

- Cleveland neighborhood
- Cleveland residents

Overall project rating:

Design: ☆ ☆ ☆ ☆

Program effectiveness: ☆ ☆

Cleveland Neighborhood Project Evaluation

Project: Rental Rehabilitation Grant Program

Project Coordinator:

- MCDA
- CNA
- Minnesota Housing Finance Agency

Voluntary Hours:

Budget:

- Initial allocation: \$100,000
- Moved: \$60,000 out to Revolving Loan Program
- Remainder: \$40,000
- Money spent on this program: \$20,000
- The balance of \$20,000 is moved out and the program is closed

Project Objective:

- To encourage Cleveland neighborhood rental property owners to improve their property condition and to bring their properties to code, by providing financial assistance.
- The goal was to impact the decline in rental property conditions and to stabilize rental properties in the Cleveland neighborhood.

Project Details:

- Matching Grant Program for Rental Properties in the Cleveland neighborhood.
- Initially the grant matched 15% of the total cost, up to a maximum of \$5000 and the owner had to pay the balance 85%.
- Later this program was redesigned because of lacking participation by the rental property owners. The match was raised to 50% of the total assessed expenditure. The owner had to pay the remainder 50%.
- The rental property owners could borrow a loan from MCDA.
- MCDA rehabilitation specialists were available to help assess the property owners the work that was needed to bring their property to code.
- Property owners had the option of obtaining a loan through MHFA to help with their portion of the match program.

Areas for improvement:

The project closed due to non-participation of rental property owners. Funds were moved towards other projects. The rental property owners were not interested in this program. Most of the property in Cleveland neighborhood is owner occupied.

Beneficiaries:

- This project was semi-successful. Only 6 participants benefited from this program.
- This program was a good idea.
- It was a good effort.
- The program could not take off.
- The rental property owners were outreached three times but there was not much success in involving them in this program.

Program Design:

☆ ☆ ☆ ☆

Program success in neighborhood:

☆ ☆

Cleveland Neighborhood Project Evaluation**Project: Permanent Landscaping Program****Project coordinator:**

- CNA housing committee

Affiliated personnel:

Volunteer hours:

- No accurate record present.

Budget:

- \$20,500

Money actually spent:

Project objectives:

- Provision of grants to neighborhood property owners to help them improve the look of Cleveland neighborhood boulevards, front or side yards through use of plantation and other permanent landscaping projects.

Project details:

- Provision of grants to residents of Cleveland neighborhood.
- Maximum amount \$200.
- Minimum amount \$50.
- To improve the outlook of the neighborhood, front and side yards of the corner lots.
- The money was used for permanent landscaping project only.
- The projects done using the money had to be highly visible to the general public, and they had to promote cultural heritage of the community.
- The money could be used for either residential or commercial properties.

Areas for improvements:

Recommendations for future improvements or additional program needs:

Beneficiaries:

- 62 applicants for the grant.

Overall project rating:



Project: Pedestrian friendly lighting for Lowry Ave. N & Penn Ave. N

Project Coordinator:

- CNA
- NRP
- Minneapolis City Council
- MCDA home improvement and finance department
- Hennepin County Public Works

Affiliated personnel:

- Brigit Shea
- Mike Chason
- Ligea Chelneky
- Mike Uker
- Chris Dahlberg
- Sue Nelson
- Connie Wood

Volunteer hours:

- No accurate data available to calculate volunteer hours.

Capital cost of project:

- \$582,000

Project objective:

- To beautify the neighborhood.
- To enhance and maintain the existing value of the property.
- To increase the feeling of safety among the Cleveland residents.

Project details:

- The area where lighting project was planned is from Xerxes Avenue N to Newton Avenue N and along Penn Avenue from 30th Avenue N to Dowling Avenue N.
- Signatures from 65% of all the affected property owners along the project area had to be secured in order to move the project forward and the City of Minneapolis hearing followed this. All the effected were to be notified of the hearing time and place by the City.
- The capital cost of the project was \$582,000 spread over 20 year period time.
- CNA had \$385,000 available in NRP funds to help the homeowners and business owners to bring down their assessments.
- Ballpark figures for this lighting were \$0.45/sq. feet for residential areas and \$0.80 for business sectors such as Lowry Avenue and Penn Avenue N.
- NRP contribution reduced the assessment rate to \$23-28 per 100 sq. feet plus the interest on the unpaid balance.
- It was planned that the property owners would pay the assessment for the lighting and the cost would be reduced by NRP contribution of funds.
- For residential property owners a grant program was available.
- The assessment could be deferred if the property owner was a senior citizen or disabled. The deferment of assessment was till death, sale of property, and loss of house stead status or loss of hardship status.
- There was no assessment for the operation and maintenance of these lights except in the vicinity of Penn-Lowry intersection.

- A neighborhood survey was conducted in April 2000 which indicated the following:
- 58% respondents favored pedestrian lighting in Cleveland, 40% opposed pedestrian lighting in Cleveland neighborhood and 2% remained undecided.
- When the committee recommended starting phase I with lighting along Penn Avenue and Lowry, following was the break-down of those supporting the lighting:
 - Penn Avenue/Lowry Avenue 52%
 - Cleveland neighborhood in entirety 28%
 - Cleveland avenue-by-avenue 8%
 - Lowry Avenue only 4%
 - Penn Avenue only 4%
 - Support lighting idea in general 4%
- In April 2000 the CAN recommended that the lighting project be pursued in two phases. Phase I included lighting Penn-Lowry and Phase II included lighting Cleveland Neighborhood entirety.

Evaluation of the lighting project:

- This project never took off the ground.
- There was a disagreement regarding whether the property owners and residents should pay for this lighting project or the City of Minneapolis should be paying for this project.
- It was decided that lighting is the responsibility of the City, and that this money should be utilized in other project beneficial for the neighborhood, which the City would not pay for.

Recommendations for future lighting program:

Cleveland Neighborhood Project Evaluation

Project: Clean sweep

Project Coordinator:

- Cleveland Neighborhood – Amy Brock
- Folwell Neighborhood – Bonnie Moore

Affiliated Organization:

- City of Minneapolis

Volunteers:

- Adults: 78
- Youth: 3

Budget:

- \$750

Project Objective:

- To clean Cleveland Neighborhood
- To help the Cleveland Neighborhood residents in cleaning their properties
- To help the residents get rid of waste material that they cant transport easily in their personal conveyance, or they have to spent money to remove this waste material from their properties
- To provide residents an opportunity to interact with neighborhood, volunteers and personnel at the city solid waste division
- To facilitate coordination and cooperation between Cleveland neighborhood and Folwel neighborhood

Project details:

- The residents were notified about the clean sweep event through flyers, word of mouth, newsletter and meetings
- This was a joint project between Folwel and Cleveland neighborhood
- The city of Minneapolis-solid waste and recycling division was requested to provide garbage trucks
- The city of Minneapolis provided the garbage truck and information on organizing this event and the type of waste and its management
- The event started at 8AM and ended at 3PM
- There were 5 garbage trucks, 2 special voucher trucks
- 2 volunteers brought their own pick ups
- One neighborhood business provided its own truck with a trailer
- Residents cleaned out their properties and the volunteers helped load the waste on trucks
- Police was requested to provide cover

Areas for improvements:

- The police did not participate as requested earlier through an application
- More volunteers are required
- There should be an arrangement by the City to help residents get rid of hazardous materials

Beneficiaries:

- Cleveland neighborhood residents
- City of Minneapolis

Overall project rating:



Cleveland Neighborhood Project Evaluation

Project: Friends of Cleveland (Business Exterior Grant)

Project Coordinator:

- CNA-Community and Economic Development Committee
- MCDA

Affiliated personnel:

- Christopher Dahlberg
- Brigid Shea
- Eric Hanson

Volunteer hours:

- No accurate record available.

Budget:

- \$16,000

Money actually spent:

Project objective:

- This fund was available for the business owners to improve the appearances of their properties in which their businesses were located.

Project details:

- This was a 1:1 matching grant program and each grant had to be matched.
- Property owner could get loan from MCDA, private lenders, private donors or savings.
- The grant funding was to improve exteriors and make renovations/improvements.
- The renovation work had to be performed by city of Minneapolis licensed, bonded and insured building contractors.
- The renovations had to be visible and have an impact.
- The renovations had to contribute to the aesthetic character of the neighborhood.
- This was available for business owners who had their businesses located within Cleveland Neighborhood along Penn & Lowry Avenues.
- Project area included properties along west side of Penn between Lowry and Dowling and on the north side of Lowry between Penn and Xerxes.
- Both owner occupied and leased properties were eligible.

Recommendations for future improvements or additional program needs:

- This program was changed into the Landscape Grant Program.

- This program was ineffective to improve the exterior of businesses to a great level.
- One of the grant recipients used the money to black top the driveway. This was not considered an appropriate use of money by the CNA.
- The landscape grant program had a maximum grant limit of \$200 that was much less than \$2000 available in the Business Exterior Grant program.
- More people could get money in this way to improve their exteriors, and this had a greater impact on the beautification of the Cleveland Neighborhood.

Beneficiaries:

- Selected business owners.

Areas of improvement:

- The program was converted into Landscape Grant Program.

Overall project rating:



Cleveland Neighborhood Project Evaluation

Project: South East Asian Initiative

Project Coordinator:

- Tom Yank

Affiliated Personnel:

- Sue Nelson
- Terry Wilson
- Cha Lee
- Char Perry
- Jay Clark

Volunteer Hours:

- Approximately 5000 hours

Budget:

- \$60,000 per year

Money spent on the project:

- \$120,000

Program Duration:

- 2 years

Project Objective:

- To involve the South East Asian residents of Cleveland neighborhood in community affairs.
- Provide solutions to South East Asian resident needs.

- To be sensitive to the issues that South East Asian residents are facing

Project Details:

1. Translation Card:

- South East Asian residents carry this card in the glove compartments of their cars.
- This card contains telephone numbers of: Residents neighbor, a friend and a translator.
- Police officers or Para-medics can communicate with these contacts via telephone in case of emergency, when the resident has difficulty speaking English language.

2. Monthly Meetings:

- These meetings provide information to South East Asian residents on civil rights and domestic abuse.

3. Educational Literature:

- Distribution of informative literature on issues and topics like crime and school, among the South East Asian residents.

4. Block Visits:

- The South East Asian residents were acquainted with the board members.

5. Document Translation:

- This program was developed to translate documents in Hmong

language. The documents were: Accident reports form and arrest report form.

6. Community Garden, Hawthorn

- South East Asian plants were grown as a part of this program.

Areas for improvement:

- Expanded outreach program that includes frequent visits to the new incoming South East Asian residents in the neighborhood.
- Improved and better outreach to non-Hmong South East Asian neighbors.
- Involve Hmong community in community activities.
- Change environment for Hmongs.

Recommendations for future improvements or additional program needs:

- Provide funding for provision of food at meetings.

Beneficiaries:

- South East Asian residents.
- Cleveland neighborhood community.

Overall project rating:

☆ ☆ ☆ ☆

Cleveland Neighborhood Project Evaluation

Project: Summer Festival

Project Coordinator:

- Amy Brock
- C.N.A.

Affiliated Personnel:

- CNA board members
- NRP
- MCDA
- Lowry/Emerson police substation
- Minneapolis park and recreational board
- Local merchants
- Neighborhood volunteers

Volunteer hours:

Budget:

- \$ 3181
- NRP money - \$707
- Donations - \$1599
- Park board - \$875

Project objective:

- To bring the community members and neighborhood residents together
- To create a spirit of neighborliness
- To plan a recreational event that would not cost the residents any money.
- To create a sense of pride among the Cleveland residents
- To develop a sense of understanding between the neighborhood residents, the police and the CNA.

Project details:

- The following events and activities were organized at the festival:
Prize drawings, free ice cream, popcorn, coffee, free pony rides, craft sale, book mobile, visit from McGruff crime dog, local fire dept., mounted patrol, ambulance, kid's games all day, fire throwing juggler, free face painting, clown, stilt walkers, food and drinks served by Tootie's on Lowry, Hmong dancers, clown, juggler, illusion theatre and Chanhassen.

Project Evaluation:

This was a very well organized project. It attracted over a 1000 residents and visitors. The volunteers worked hard to make this event successful. The credit goes to Amy Brock who planned and organized this event.

Overall rating:



[illegible]

[illegible]

[REDACTED]

[illegible]

[illegible][illegible]

[illegible]